UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

CR-95-31

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA : (FB)

-against-

United States Courthouse

1

: Brooklyn, New York

GEORGE ZAPPOLA,

and GEORGE CONTE,

: May 15, 1996

5:15 p.m.

Defendant. :

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE FREDERIC BLOCK UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:

ZACHARY W. CARTER

United States Attorney BY: JAIME ORENSTEIN STEPHEN KELLY

Assistant United States Attorneys

225 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, New York 11201

For Defendant Zappola: JAMES LA ROSSA, ESQ.

ANDREW WEINSTEIN, ESQ.

For Defendant Conte:

KEITH WATANABE, ESQ.

RAFAEL ABROMOWITZ, ESQ.

Court Reporter:

Diana Pereira

Certified Realtime Reporter

225 Cadman Plaza East - Room 377

Brooklyn, New York (718) 330-1781

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by CAT.

1 THE CLERK: United States of America versus George Zappola and George Conte, criminal cause for pleading. 2 3 Can counsel state their appearances for the record. 4 MR. ORENSTEIN: Jaime Orenstein and Stephen Kelly 5 for the government. 6 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Orenstein and 7 Mr. Kelly. 8 MR. WATANABE: For Defendant George Conte, William 9 Keith Watanabe and Rafael Abromowitz. 10 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 11 MR. LA ROSSA: For the Defendant Zappola, your Honor, 12 James LaRossa and Andrew Weinstein. 13 THE COURT: All right. 14 Mr. Abromowitz is going to be handling this for your 15 client? 16 MR. WATANABE: I will be handling the matter, your 17 Honor. 18 THE COURT: Let me just make a note since this is the first time that I am focusing on you. 19 20 Give me your name again. 21 MR. WATANABE: Watanabe, WATANABE. 22 THE COURT: Let's just focus for a moment on how best 23 we can process all of this. Obviously, we're going to be here for some period of time since we're talking about the 24 allocution to many, many counts in the indictment. My 25

1 suggestion is that we try to combine whatever we can put 2 together collectively, so to speak. In that respect, in terms 3 of advising the defendants of their rights and the rights they'll be waiving if they go forward and plead quilty, et 5 cetera, if it's agreeable to counsel, I would like to do that collectively. 6 7 MR. LA ROSSA: It's agreeable. 8 Yes, your Honor. MR. ORENSTEIN: 9 THE COURT: In terms of the allocution aspects, we're going to have to do that, obviously, individually. I know of 10 11 no other way of doing that. Let's see how it goes along. 12 Do you have any other suggestions, any of you folks, 13 in terms of how we can properly, effectively process all of this? 14 15 Mr. Orenstein? 16 MR. ORENSTEIN: No, Judge. It may prove easier when 17 we get down to it, for some counts that both defendants are going to enter pleas to, we could cover that count with one 18 19 defendant and then with the next before moving on to the next 20 count. 21 THE COURT: I take it that there's been a 22 considerable effort in terms of the allocution that will be 23 forthcoming, that these matters have been discussed very 24 carefully, that the defendants realize that they are going to

have to appropriately and clearly allocute.

Mr. LaRossa, is there any problem in that respect? 1 2 MR. LA ROSSA: I think they're going to allocute 3 properly and completely. 4 THE COURT: Mr. Watanabe? 5 MR. WATANABE: I anticipate no problems, Judge. 6 THE COURT: Let's do this. Let's start by first 7 acknowledging that I do have two plea agreements. One 8 purportedly executed by the Defendant Zappola, which I marked 9 Exhibit 1, and the other purportedly executed by the Defendant Conte, which I have marked Court Exhibit 2. 10 11 (So marked) 12 THE COURT: I will address appropriate questions to 13 each of these defendants in the course of the proceedings. 14 At this time, let's have both defendants sworn. 15 (Defendant George Zappola duly sworn) 16 (Defendant George Conte duly sworn) THE COURT: 17 I also understand now that we do have an 18 information, and maybe we ought to at this time first waive indictment. 19 20 I have the information, which charges Mr. Conte with six counts. I am looking for the information in respect to 21 22 Mr. Zappola, which I do not seem to have. 23 I do have that now. 24 That charges Mr. Zappola with six counts as well. 25 I have now the waiver of indictment signed by Mr.

```
1
    Conte, waiver of indictment signed by Mr. Zappola.
 2
             Mr. Conte, this is your signature, I take it?
 3
             DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, it is.
 4
             THE COURT: Mr. Zappola, this is your signature?
 5
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA:
                                 Yes.
 6
             THE COURT: Mr. LaRossa, you witnessed Mr. Zappola's
 7
    signature?
 8
             MR. LA ROSSA: I did, sir.
 9
             THE COURT: Counsel from the defendant here.
10
    make out that signature?
11
             MR. WATANABE:
                             I did, Judge.
12
             THE COURT: You witnessed that as well?
13
             MR. WATANABE:
                             I did.
14
             THE COURT: I tell each of you, by signing this waiver
15
    of indictment you have agreed to proceed in respect to those
16
    six counts by information and not by indictment. You have
17
    waived your rights to have a grand jury consider all of this
    and prefer charges against you if deemed appropriate to do
18
19
    so.
20
             The waiver of indictment specifically states that you
21
    are each being accused of three counts of murder in aid of
22
    racketeering in violation of 18, U.S.C., Section 1959(a)(1)
23
    and three counts of conspiracy to commit murder in aid of
    racketeering in violation of Title 18, U.S.C.,
24
25
    Section 1959(a)(5).
```

1 This specifically states that based upon the proposed 2 information, the nature of the charges, and your rights, you 3 hereby waive in open court on this day prosecution by 4 indictment and consent that the proceeding may be by 5 information rather than by indictment. 6 Do you each understand that? 7 Mr. Conte? 8 DEFENDANT CONTE: 9 THE COURT: Do you understand that as well, 10 Mr. Zappola? 1.1 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes. I will sign these at this time. 12 THE COURT: 13 MR. ORENSTEIN: One slight correction. 14 Mr. Zappola's waiver of indictment form specifies two 15 counts of murder and four counts of conspiracy. 16 THE COURT: You are correct. 17 Let the record reflect that Mr. Zappola is being 18 charged with two counts of murder in aid of racketeering in violation of 18, U.S.C., Section 1959(a)(1) and four counts of 19 conspiracy to commit murder in aid of racketeering in 20 21 violation of 18, U.S.C., Section 1959(a)(5). 22 Thank you for correcting me in that respect, 23 Mr. Orenstein. 24 All right, I have signed both agreements. 25 Having been sworn, Mr. Zappola and Mr. Conte, you can

```
7
 1
    stay seated, if it's more comfortable for you, while I go
 2
    through everything.
 3
             I want you each to understand, first of all, that if
 4
    you do not answer questions that I am going to pose to you
 5
    honestly, if you do not allocute honestly, if you say anything
 6
    that's not correct, that you can be prosecuted for perjury or
 7
    for making a false statement.
 8
             Do you understand that?
 9
             DEFENDANT CONTE:
                                 Yes.
10
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes.
11
             THE COURT: Let me ask first, Mr. Zappola, to state
12
    your full name.
13
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: George Zappola.
             THE COURT: And, Mr. Conte, state for the record your
14
15
    full name.
16
             DEFENDANT CONTE:
                                George Conte.
17
             THE COURT:
                         Mr. Zappola, tell me, how old are you?
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: I will be 37 tomorrow.
18
19
             THE COURT: Mr. Conte, how old are you?
20
             DEFENDANT CONTE:
                                I'm 35 years old.
21
             THE COURT: Mr. Zappola, what education or schooling
22
    have you had so far?
23
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Graduated high school.
24
             THE COURT: Where was that?
25
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Staten Island, New York.
```

```
1
   York High School.
2
             THE COURT: Mr. Conte, how about you?
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: I went to Lafayette High School,
3
4
   and I stopped at the 10th grade.
5
             THE COURT: The 10th grade?
            DEFENDANT CONTE:
6
                               Yes.
7
             THE COURT: It is obvious both of you are able to
8
    speak English and understand English.
9
             Is there any problem I should be made aware of in
10
    that respect, Mr. Zappola, or, Mr. Conte?
             DEFENDANT CONTE: No.
11
12
             THE COURT: Mr. Zappola, have you had any difficulty
13
    in communicating with your attorney, Mr. LaRossa?
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA:
14
                                 No.
15
             THE COURT: Mr. Conte, have you had any problem
    communicating with your attorney, Mr. Watanabe?
16
17
             DEFENDANT CONTE: Not at all.
             THE COURT: Are you presently or have you been under
18
19
   the care of a physician or psychiatrist, either of you?
             DEFENDANT CONTE:
20
                               No.
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: No.
21
             THE COURT: In the past 24 hours, have either of you
22
23
   taken any narcotic drugs, medicine or pills or drunk any
   alcoholic beverages?
24
25
            DEFENDANT CONTE: No.
```

9

1 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: No. 2 THE COURT: All right. 3 Is your mind clear? 4 Do you have any problems in understanding what is happening here in court today? 5 6 Mr. Zappola? 7 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yeah, my mind is clear. THE COURT: Clear mind. 8 9 You understand everything that's going on? 1.0 DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes. 11 THE COURT: A lot of these questions may seem kind of 12 supercilious or not really terrible relevant, but it is 13 terribly important that we comply with what the law requires 14 that we do as judges when we take a plea. Part of this is set forth in statutes and we have to be meticulous going through 15 16 it even though it may seem somewhat not relevant to you. 17 Mr. LaRossa, have you discussed this matter fully 18 with your client? Are you satisfied he understands the rights 19 he will be waiving if he goes forward with his contemplated 20 pleas of guilty? And is he capable of understanding the 21 nature of all these proceedings? 22 MR. LA ROSSA: He is. 23 THE COURT: Have you discussed this matter with your 24 client fully? 25 MR. WATANABE: I have.

1 THE COURT: Does he understand the rights he will be waiving by pleading guilty and does he understand the nature 2 of these proceedings? 3 4 MR. WATANABE: He does, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Do you have any doubts, Mr. LaRossa, as to Mr. Zappola's competence to plead guilty at this time? 6 7 MR. LA ROSSA: No, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Do you have any doubts, Mr. Watanabe, in 9 respect to your client's competence to plead at this time? 10 MR. WATANABE: No, Judge. THE COURT: Have each of you advised your respective 11 12 clients of the maximum sentence and fine that can be imposed, and have each of you discussed with your respective clients 13 14 the operation of the sentencing guidelines and specifically 15 how they pertain and apply to their circumstances? 16 MR. LA ROSSA: Yes, your Honor. 17 MR. WATANABE: Yes, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: Mr. Zappola, have you had a full opportunity to discuss your case with Mr. LaRossa? Are you 19 20 satisfied with the way he has represented to you to date? Are you satisfied with having him continue to represent you? 21 22 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes. 23 THE COURT: I ask you the same question, Mr. Conte. Have you had a full opportunity to discuss your case with your 24 25 attorneys, Mr. Abromowitz and Mr. Watanabe? Are you satisfied

```
11
 1
    with their representation?
 2
             DEFENDANT CONTE:
                              Yes.
 3
             THE COURT: And are you satisfied with having them
 4
    continue to represent you?
 5
             DEFENDANT CONTE:
                               Yes.
 6
             THE COURT: The answer is yes to that?
 7
             DEFENDANT CONTE:
                               Yes.
 8
             THE COURT: Have each of you received a copy of the
 9
    indictment and a copy of the information which has now been
    filed, and have each of you consulted with your attorney about
10
11
    every charge that is set forth in the underlying indictment
12
    and in the information?
13
             Mr. Zappola, yes or no?
14
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA:
                                 Yes.
15
             THE COURT: Mr. Conte, yes or no?
16
             DEFENDANT CONTE:
                               Yes.
17
             THE COURT: Do each of you understand all the charges
    that have been leveled and brought against you in the
18
19
    indictment and now in the information?
20
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes.
21
             DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes.
22
             THE COURT: Is there anything about any of these
23
    charges that you have any concerns about or are confused about
    or do not understand?
24
25
             Mr. Zappola?
```

1 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes. 2 THE COURT: You understand everything? 3 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes. 4 THE COURT: Is there anything that you do not understand? 5 6 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: No. 7 THE COURT: Mr. Conte? 8 DEFENDANT CONTE: I understand everything. 9 THE COURT: Now, bear with me as I go through the rights that you have and the rights you will be waiving if you 10 11 decide to plead guilty to these charges. 12 I say this to you collectively, so each of you pay 13 close attention. The first and most important thing you must 14 15 understand is that neither of you have to plead guilty even if you are guilty. Under our system of law, the prosecutor has 16 17 the burden of proving the guilt of defendants such as yourselves beyond a reasonable doubt, and if the prosecutor is 18 unable to meet that burden of proof, then the jury has the 19 duty to find the defendant not guilty, even if he is guilty. 20 21 Furthermore, should a defendant waive their right to 22 be tried by a jury, then the Judge would have that same obligation, to find the defendant not guilty, even if they are 23 24 guilty, if the government is unable to meet their burden of 25 proof.

```
1
             Do you understand that, gentlemen?
 2
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yeah.
             THE COURT: Each of you?
 3
 4
             DEFENDANT CONTE:
 5
             THE COURT: All right.
 6
             What happens sometimes, in American courtrooms, a
    jury has returned a verdict of not guilty even though
 7
 8
    everybody in the courtroom was of the opinion that the
 9
    defendant was guilty. But what the jury was saying in those
    cases is not that the defendant was innocent but rather that
10
11
    the prosecutor or the government had failed to meets its
12
    burden of proving that the defendant was quilty.
13
             That is why I say to you that even if you gentlemen
14
    are guilty, you still have a choice. You may plead guilty, as
15
    you apparently wish to do today, or you may say to the
16
    government, in words or substance, prove it, meet your burden
   of proof of my guilt beyond a reasonable doubt.
17
18
             The way you would make that decision is by saying not
19
   guilty to all these charges when I ask you ultimately how you
20
   will plead.
21
             Do you each understand that?
22
             Mr. Zappola?
23
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA:
24
             THE COURT: Mr. Conte?
```

Yes.

DEFENDANT CONTE:

THE COURT: Now, if you decide to persist in your present status, which is not guilty to all of these charges, then under the constitution and laws of the United States you are entitled to a speedy and public trial by jury with the assistance of counsel on all the charges against you in the indictment, and now in the information. Of course you haven't pled to the information yet; there's no need to do that yet. I will ask you ultimately, of course, how you will plead to the information. At such a trial you would be presumed innocent and the government would have to overcome their presumption and prove you guilty by competent evidence and beyond a reasonable doubt. You would not have to prove that you are innocent. the government were to fail, the jury would have the duty to find you not guilty, or, once again, if you waived your right, your absolute right to be tried by a jury and chose to be tried by a judge, then the judge would have that obligation. By pleading guilty, you will be relieving the government of the burden of proving that you are indeed guilty and you will be admitting or confessing to your guilt. Do you understand that? Mr. Zappola?

Mr. Conte?

DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes.

DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

THE COURT: Now, should you decide to persist in not pleading guilty, in the course of the trial, the witnesses for the government would have to come to court and testify in your presence and your counsel would have the right to cross-examine the witnesses for the government, to object to evidence offered by the government and to offer evidence in your behalf.

At a trial, while you would have the right to testify if you chose to do so, you could not be required to do that. Under the constitution of the United States, a defendant in a criminal trial cannot be forced to take the witness stand at his trial and say anything that could be used to show that he is guilty of the crime with which he is charged. We call that, as you probably realize, a right against self-incrimination. If you decide not to testify the Court would instruct the jury that they could not hold that against you.

Do all of you understand that?

DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes.

DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, if you plead guilty, as you apparently contemplate doing, then I will have to ask you questions about what you did in order to satisfy myself that you are indeed guilty of the charges to which you seek to plead guilty, and you will have to answer my questions and

acknowledge your guilt.

Thus, you will be giving up the right that I have just described, that is, the right not to say anything that would show that you are guilty of the crime with which you are charged.

Do you each understand that?

Mr. Zappola?

DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Conte?

DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes.

THE COURT: If you plead guilty, as you plan to do, and I accept your plea, you will, therefore, be giving up your constitutional right to a trial and all the other rights that I just discussed. There will be no further trial of any kind, no right to an appeal. I will simply enter a judgment of guilty upon the basis of your guilty plea.

There are some qualifications in respect to whether you will be able to withdraw your guilty plea that are contained, as you probably realize, in the plea agreements, and I will get to that when we go through the plea agreements.

But other than those qualifications, I just want you to understand clearly that there will simply be a judgment of guilty on the basis of your guilty plea that will be entered.

Do you understand that?

DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes.

1 DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes. 2 THE COURT: Aside from what's in the plea agreement, 3 if I sentence you incorrectly under the law, you would have the right to appeal to the appellate court, which is the 4 Second Circuit Court of Appeals, but you will not be able to 5 withdraw your guilty plea. Your only remedy would be the 6 7 right to appeal if I do anything improper. The only 8 qualification on the fact that you cannot withdraw your guilty 9 plea is that which is contained in the plea agreement, which I will be getting to momentarily. 10 11 Do you all understand that? 12 Mr. Zappola? 13 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: 14 THE COURT: Mr. Conte? 15 DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes. 16 MR. ORENSTEIN: One limitation on what you just said 17 that is in the plea agreements is that the defendants have 18 each agreed in their agreements not to file an appeal in the event that the Court imposes a sentence within the range 19 20 specified in the agreement. 21 THE COURT: That's not really a qualification. I am 22 just talking about if I sentenced him unlawfully. 23 MR. ORENSTEIN: Yes. 24 THE COURT: If I obviously sentenced him, you know,

unlawfully within the range, then they are not going to be

```
18
 1
    appealing.
 2
             Do you understand that?
 3
             MR. ORENSTEIN:
                              Yes.
 4
             THE COURT:
                         But you cannot, Mr. Orenstein, preclude
 5
    somebody, from my understanding of the law, from taking an
    appeal if I absolutely, flat out, incorrectly sentence them
 6
 7
    contrary to law.
 8
             MR. ORENSTEIN: That's correct, Judge.
 9
             I am just making sure it is clear that there are
    certain claims that are being waived with respect to right to
10
11
    appeal a sentence that's spelled out in the agreement.
12
             THE COURT:
                         Do you understand that?
13
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA:
                                 Yes.
14
             THE COURT: Now, having heard all of that,
    Mr. Zappola, are you willing to give up your right to a trial
15
16
    and the other rights I have just discussed?
17
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA:
                                 Yes.
18
             THE COURT: Mr. Conte, are you also willing to give
19
    up your right to trial and the other rights that I have just
20
    discussed?
21
             DEFENDANT CONTE:
                               Yes, your Honor.
22
             THE COURT: Let's look at the plea agreements now.
23
             In respect to you, Mr. Zappola, I turn now to Page 9,
24
    the last page of the agreement.
25
             I ask you whether, in fact, this is your signature
```

1 and whether, in fact, you signed this today? 2 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes. 3 THE COURT: I ask you the same with respect to your 4 plea agreement, Mr. Conte: Is this your signature? Did you 5 sign this today? 6 DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes. 7 THE COURT: Did each of you gentlemen read this? 8 Was it explained to you, in addition to your reading 9 it, by your respective counsel? 10 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes, it was explained. 11 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes, sir. 12 THE COURT: Do any of you gentlemen have any question 13 about anything at all that's contained in this plea agreement 14 that you are not clear about and would like to question me 15 about, would like further explanation or anything else? 16 Mr. Zappola? 17 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: 18 THE COURT: Mr. Conte? 19 DEFENDANT CONTE: No, sir. 20 THE COURT: Now, having those acknowledgments is 21 helpful but nonetheless I do want to specifically advise you 22 in open court on the record, Mr. Zappola, and, Mr. Conte, in 23 this plea agreement you are each pleading guilty to Counts One 24 and Two of the indictment, which carries a maximum term of 25 imprisonment of life, a minimum term of imprisonment -- no

```
1
    minimum term, and the statute to which you are contemplating
 2
   pleading guilty in respect to Counts One and Two of the
 3
    indictment provides for a maximum supervised release term of
 4
    five years to follow any term of imprisonment, and further
 5
   provides that if a condition of release is violated, that the
 6
    defendant may be sentenced up to five years without credit for
 7
   prerelease imprisonment or time previously served on
 8
   post-release supervision.
                               The statute specifically which you
 9
    are pleading guilty to 18, U.S.C., Section 1959(a)(5) in
10
    respect to --
11
             MR. ORENSTEIN:
                             I'm sorry, Judge.
12
             THE COURT:
                         That's not true.
13
                             Count One is 1962(c).
             MR. ORENSTEIN:
14
                         Count One is 18, U.S.C., Section 1962(c)
             THE COURT:
15
    and Count Two is 18, U.S.C., Section 1962(d). 1963(a) is
    implicated also, apparently.
16
17
             MR. ORENSTEIN: That's the sentencing provision for
18
    the RICO Act.
19
             THE COURT: That's the sentencing provision.
20
             Under those statutes I have just described to you,
    the minimum term of imprisonment, the maximum term of
21
22
    imprisonment, the maximum supervised release term, I also
23
   advise you that the statutes provide for a maximum fine of
24
    $250,000 or twice the gross proceeds from the offense.
                                                             There
25
    is the possibility of restitution, $50 special assessment,
```

which I suspect is the least of your problems, and provides for other penalties, and any forfeiture of any interest acquired or maintained in violation of 18, U.S.C., Section 1962.

Now --

MR. ORENSTEIN: If I may interrupt with one matter.

With respect to supervised release, I believe you did not warn the defendants about the possibility of revocation and the possibility of five-year imprisonment if the release term is revoked.

THE COURT: Somewhat academic. The minimum and maximum sentence is life -- or the maximum sentence is life; you are quite right.

The statute provides further in terms of supervised release, as I said before, five years to follow any term of imprisonment and also that if a condition of release is violated, that the defendant may be sentenced up to five years without credit for prerelease imprisonment or time previously served on postrelease supervision.

Now, Mr. Zappola, you also are, in your plea agreement, contemplating pleading guilty to each of Counts Four, Thirteen, and Fifteen of the indictment and Counts One through Five of the information.

MR. ORENSTEIN: I'm sorry, Judge. It is One and

...

Two.

THE COURT: One and Two of the information.

And that's in respect to 18, U.S.C., Section 1959(a)(1), and the statute provides for a maximum term of imprisonment of life, a minimum term of imprisonment of zero, and a maximum supervised release term of five years to follow any term of imprisonment, and if a condition of release is violated, the defendant may be sentenced up to five years without credit for prerelease imprisonment or time previously served on postrelease supervision. The statute further provides for a maximum fine of \$250,000, the possibility of restitution and a \$50 special assessment.

MR. LA ROSSA: We think you are working off an old draft, Judge. Do you have the one that's been signed?

THE COURT: Is there anything that I said that's not

MR. ORENSTEIN: No. It was only the numbers that alerted us to the possibility.

THE COURT: I am trying to deal collectively with those that are in common. I have highlighted the original draft that way but I have not highlighted the final version which was given to me, so there may be some glitches in that respect. So just bear with me.

Now, Mr. Conte, you are, also, in your plea agreement pleading guilty to each of Counts Six, Seven, Eight, Fourteen, and Sixteen of the indictment and Counts Four through Six of

in the original?

the information. That's in violation of 18, U.S.C., Section 1959(a)(5), which statute provides for a minimum term of imprisonment of zero and a maximum term of imprisonment of ten years.

The statute also provides the penalties associated with the violation of the statute also provides for a maximum supervised release term of three years to follow any term of imprisonment, and if a condition of release is violated, then the defendant may be sentenced up to two years without credit for prerelease imprisonment or time previously served on postrelease supervision. The statute also provides for a maximum fine of \$250,000, possible restitution and \$50 special assessment.

Each of you gentlemen are also in your respective plea agreements pleading guilty to Count Nineteen of the indictment. I advise each of you collectively now that the count refers to 18, U.S.C., Section 3, which provides for a minimum term of imprisonment of zero, maximum term of imprisonment of 15 years. Also, maximum supervised release term of three years to follow any term of imprisonment.

If a condition of release is violated, the defendant may be sentenced up to two years without credit for prerelease imprisonment or time previously served in postrelease supervision. The statute also provides for a maximum \$250,000, possible restitution and a \$50 special assessment.

I further point out to you gentlemen, each of you in your respective plea agreements are pleading guilty to Count Twenty of the indictment.

The specific statute which you are pleading guilty to is 18, U.S.C., Section 1071, and penalties for violating that statute are a minimum term of imprisonment of zero, a maximum term of imprisonment of five years and a maximum supervised release term of three years to follow any term of imprisonment. If a condition of release is violated, the defendant may be sentenced up to two years without credit for prerelease imprisonment or time previously served on postrelease supervision. The statute also provides for a maximum fine of \$250,000, possible restitution and a \$50 special assessment.

Each of you gentlemen are also pleading guilty to Count Twenty-one of the indictment. That charges you with violating 18, U.S.C., Section 371. The penalties for violating that statutory provision is a minimum term of imprisonment of zero to a maximum term of imprisonment of five years, a maximum supervised release term of three years to follow any term of imprisonment. If a condition of release is violated, the defendant may be sentenced up to two years without credit for prerelease imprisonment and time previously served on postrelease supervision. The statutory provisions further provide for a maximum fine of \$250,000, possible

```
1
    restitution and $50 special assessment.
 2
             Did I miss any?
 3
             MR. ORENSTEIN: I don't believe so, Judge.
 4
             MR. ORENSTEIN: Just to make sure the record is
 5
    clear, perhaps you could inquire of each defendant if they
    understood all the maximum and minimum amounts.
 6
 7
             THE COURT: I will do that.
 8
             Mr. Zappola, do you have any question in terms of
 9
    your understanding of all of the penalties that apply to
10
    pleading guilty to those charges?
11
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA:
                                 No. No question.
             THE COURT: Obviously, there's a whole bunch of them.
12
13
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: I wouldn't remember them anyway
14
    so I am not going to ask.
15
             THE COURT: Mr. Conte, anything you may not
16
    understand?
17
             Do you understand any penalties associated with these
    crimes you contemplate pleading guilty to?
18
19
             DEFENDANT CONTE:
                               Yes.
20
             THE COURT: I am not going to read the entire plea
21
    agreement. I have no fear about that. I am satisfied that
22
   you have acknowledged that you understand this, that your
   attorneys will acknowledge to me now that they have fully
23
24
   explained the plea agreement to their respective clients.
             Mr. LaRossa, if that's not the case so tell me.
25
```

```
1
             MR. LA ROSSA: That is the case, your Honor.
 2
             THE COURT: Are you satisfied they understand each
    and every aspect of the intricacies of this agreement?
 3
 4
             MR. LA ROSSA: Completely.
 5
             THE COURT: Mr. Watanabe, how about you on behalf of
 6
    your client?
 7
             MR. WATANABE:
                              I have explained to him, Judge.
 8
    understands.
 9
             THE COURT:
                         I think under those circumstances there
10
    is no need for me to go through this, except the waiver issue
11
    is something which is worthy of highlighting I guess.
             The agreement provides that if I were to reject the
12
13
    plea agreement, then the defendants will have an opportunity
14
    to withdraw the plea. If I do not reject the plea agreement,
15
    then you're bound by it, and you will not be able to withdraw
16
    the plea come what may.
17
             I previously told you that if I were to sentence you
    improperly, incorrectly, contrary to the law, then your only
18
19
    remedy would be to appeal but you could not withdraw your plea
20
    of guilty.
             Do you understand that perfectly well, Mr. Zappola?
21
22
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA:
                                 Yes.
             THE COURT: Do you understand that perfectly well,
23
24
   Mr. Conte?
25
             DEFENDANT CONTE:
                               Yes.
```

THE COURT: Also, with respect to what Mr. Orenstein alluded to before, that in Paragraph 3 of the plea agreement each of you defendants agree not to file an appeal in the event that the Court imposes a sentence at or below that set forth in Paragraph 2 which spells out the sentence agreement under Rule 11 of the criminal rules.

That is what you were referring to before,

Mr. Orenstein?

MR. ORENSTEIN: It was, Judge. Thank you.

THE COURT: I just want to pause to commend all of

THE COURT: I just want to pause to commend all of you for the effort that you made in being very specific in terms of the names of the people that are set forth in Paragraph 4. I think attention to that type of draftsmanship is very important in these matters, as you probably realize, and you are to be commended for making that type of effort here. I think it just can save an awful lot of possible problems that could possibly surface in the future, I am happy to say.

MR. WEINSTEIN: While we're on Paragraph 4, the language you are talking about I assume is where the government agrees not to bring any further criminal charges against the defendants for information provided by them and it lists a number of cooperating witnesses.

I think it's important just to put on the record that the way we got to that, and included that specific language,

1 the intent of the parties, was to cover all known crimes by 2 the government. And the government, I believe, is ready to 3 represent that they are not aware of any information from other individuals which would not also be covered by the 4 5 individuals mentioned in the agreement? 6 THE COURT: Is that an accurate representation by 7 counsel, Mr. Orenstein? MR. ORENSTEIN: Judge, we have endeavored, and it is 8 9 my understanding that all of the understandings between the 10 parties are reflected in this agreement and that nothing that 11 is said in this room is going to alter, amend, or add to those 12 understandings. 13 Now, with respect to what Mr. Weinstein has just 14 said, it is the government's understanding that there are no 15 additional crimes that we intend to prosecute. It is 16 explicitly spelled out. We do not have the power to bind 17 other districts. However, I have made a representation that I personally do not know of any other pending charge, 18 investigation, that may result in an indictment of these 19 20 defendants. I wanted to be explicit that I don't have the 21 power to bind other districts. 22 THE COURT: Are you representing that the Eastern 23 District office has no such knowledge? 24 MR. ORENSTEIN: I have been asked for representation

of my personal knowledge. I have none. I cannot speak beyond

```
1
           The plea agreement which we have worked very hard to
    come to has the terms that we agreed to. Those terms are that
 2
    we have debriefed the witnesses who are named here.
 3
 4
    witnesses have provided us with information. We do not intend
    to charge these defendants further with any crimes that these
 5
 6
    witnesses have provided us information about.
 7
             THE COURT:
                          "We" meaning the Eastern District?
 8
             MR. ORENSTEIN:
                             Exactly.
 9
             THE COURT: Is that perfectly understood?
10
             MR. LA ROSSA: Can we go off the record for a minute,
11
    please; permit counsel to talk?
12
             THE COURT: You need a chance to chat with each
    other?
13
14
             MR. LA ROSSA:
                             Yes.
15
             THE COURT: Let's do that.
16
             (Pause).
17
             THE COURT: The record should be clear nothing is
    transpiring off the record except we are accommodating
18
    Mr. LaRossa's request in asking for the opportunity to talk
19
20
    with Mr. Orenstein.
21
             (Pause)
22
             THE COURT: You have had an opportunity to chat with
    Mr. Orenstein?
23
24
             MR. ORENSTEIN: For the record, we have remained on
25
    the record; we were just conferring among ourselves.
```

The Eastern District is not aware of any crimes, criminal activity other than the information that's been provided by these named witnesses. Thus, if there are other people who are providing information, as far as we are aware, they are not providing information about crimes not also -- let me start again.

THE COURT: Start from the beginning.

MR. ORENSTEIN: To the extent there may be other people who are providing information to us, that information, as far as we are aware, is duplicative of information provided by named witnesses in this instrument. Therefore, there are no additional crimes that we are aware of.

MR. WEINSTEIN: Which gets us back to the proposition that we started with, which is this sentence represents all known crimes in the Eastern District? It is just worded in this fashion so that we wanted to be sure, for example, by naming these individuals -- my concern was, for example, if there was information provided by somebody who is not listed here, is that covered?

And Mr. Orenstein represented to the extent that there was any information provided by people not listed, it would also be duplicative of the information provided by the people named in the agreement.

MR. ORENSTEIN: That's correct.

MR. WATANABE: That is our understanding as well,

...

Judge.

MR. ORENSTEIN: That is not intended, I am sure counsel will agree, as an alteration of anything that's in the written agreement.

MR. WEINSTEIN: No. Just to explain how we got to naming those particular people.

THE COURT: You are all being appropriately circumspect. I think that suffices.

My own sense of these things is that if there is any misrepresentation by the government that rises to the level of the equivalent of bad faith, that is the type of thing that would come under due process principles. We had discussions about this in the course of the hearing that we had. But I am satisfied that you gentlemen have done the best that you can to try to contemplate possibilities where we do not have a crystal ball, perhaps, in front of us. I don't think we can do better than what you have done right here.

So with this colloquy in place now, I will ask specifically, to be redundant, perhaps, Mr. Zappola and Mr. Conte, whether you have any questions whatsoever about anything that was said in court today, any other representation made by respective counsel, anything contained in the plea agreement, anything that I have endeavored to explain to you in terms of your rights, the waiver of your rights, or anything else that may be on your mind right now?

```
1
             This is a chance to speak to the judge.
 2
    Mr. Zappola?
 3
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA:
                                  No.
 4
             THE COURT: You are okay with everything?
 5
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes.
 6
             THE COURT: Mr. Conte, how about you?
 7
             MR. WATANABE:
                             One minute, Judge.
 8
             DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, I understand, your Honor.
 9
             THE COURT: All right.
10
             Now, I ask each of you whether or not your
11
    willingness to plead guilty results from discussions that took
    place between the attorneys for the government and the
12
    defendants or the defendants' attorneys. Mr. LaRossa and Mr.
13
    Watanabe, is there anything else other than what has been
14
    spoken about in court today in respect to the negotiations
15
    that have transpired and whether or not they have had an
16
17
    impact upon your client's agreeing to this plea agreement and
18
    agreeing to ultimately plead guilty?
19
             MR. LA ROSSA:
                             No, sir.
20
             THE COURT: Mr. Watanabe?
21
             MR. WATANABE:
                             No, Judge.
22
             THE COURT:
                         Okay.
23
             Now, Mr. Zappola and Mr. Conte, other than the
24
    promises outlined in the plea agreements, has anyone made any
    promises that caused you to contemplate pleading guilty?
25
```

1 Yes or no? 2 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: 3 THE COURT: Mr. Conte? 4 DEFENDANT CONTE: No. 5 THE COURT: And, of course, what I have explained to you in respect to the plea agreement as well. 6 7 And I ask each of you, has anyone made any promises 8 as to what your sentence will be other than that what is contained in the plea agreement and as explained in Court 9 10 today? 11 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: No. 12 THE COURT: Mr. Conte? 13 DEFENDANT CONTE: No. 14 THE COURT: All right. 15 I want to just reinforce that, of course, the plea agreement does set forth the agreed-upon sentence under 16 17 Rule 11 of the Criminal Rules and that you will be sentenced 18

in accordance with the agreement and specifically as set forth in Rule 11 and as required by law and that I will be obliged to comply with the law in respect to that. I am not going to go into more detail since I am satisfied that it is fully set forth in the plea agreement.

At this time, I am going to ask you, Mr. Zappola, whether you are ready to plead. Just tell me yes or no.

DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes.

19

20

21

22

23

24

24 THE COURT: How do you plead in respect to Count Two of the indictment; guilty or not guilty? 25

DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Guilty.

35 1 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Guilty. 2 THE COURT: How do you plead in respect to Counts 4, 13 and 15 of the indictment and Counts One and Two 3 4 of the information? 5 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Guilty. 6 THE COURT: In respect to each count of the 7 information and each count of the indictment? 8 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes, your Honor. 9 THE COURT: How do you plead in respect to each: Counts Three, Five, Seven and Six, Seven, Twelve, Fourteen and 10 Sixteen of the indictment and Counts Three through Six of the 11 12 information; guilty or not guilty? 13 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Guilty. THE COURT: How do you plead in respect to Count 14 Nineteen of the indictment; not guilty or guilty? 15 16 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Guilty. 17 THE COURT: How do you plead with respect to Count 18 Twenty of the indictment; guilty or not guilty? 19 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Guilty. 20 THE COURT: How do you plead to Count Twenty-one of the indictment; guilty or not guilty? 21 22 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Guilty. 23 THE COURT: Mr. Conte, before I get to you: 24 Mr. Zappola, are you making these pleas of guilty

25

voluntarily and of your own free will?

36 1 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes. 2 THE COURT: Has anyone threatened or forced you to 3 plead guilty to any of these counts? 4 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: 5 THE COURT: Has anyone made any promises as to what 6 your sentence will be other than what is contained in the plea 7 agreement and what's been discussed in court today? 8 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: 9 THE COURT: Mr. Conte? 10 DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes. 11 THE COURT: Are you ready to plead guilty at this 12 time? 13 DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Mr. Watanabe, do you know of any reason 14 why your client should not plead guilty to these charges? Are 15 16 you aware of any legal defense to the charges? 17 MR. WATANABE: No, Judge. 18 THE COURT: And, Mr. Orenstein, once again, does the 19 government have any knowledge that should be imparted to the Court with respect to my willingness to accept these pleas? 20 21 MR. ORENSTEIN: We're aware of nothing that should dissuade you. 22 THE COURT: At this time, Mr. Conte, I ask you, what 23 24 is your plea in respect to each of Counts One and Two of the

25

indictment; guilty or not guilty?

THE COURT: Has anyone made any promises to you as to what your sentence will be in respect to this other than what's set forth in the plea agreement and as explained to you in Court today?

DEFENDANT CONTE: No, sir.

THE COURT: Now, at this time, I guess I will start with Mr. Zappola in terms of the allocutions.

Mr. Zappola, you can stay seated.

I am not going to read to you all of these counts but just, perhaps, it might be helpful if I were to just highlight some of the aspects of these counts just to maybe assist you in your allocution.

January 1978 to the present date and charges you and others with being employed by and associated with the Luchese Crime Family, which enterprise engaged in, and the activities of which affected, interstate commerce. And it goes on to charge you with willfully, unlawfully and knowingly conducting and participating, directly and indirectly, in the conduct of the affairs of that enterprise through a pattern of racketeering activity, and specifically sets forth a number of multiple racketeering acts.

At this time, I am going to ask you to tell me, what did you do in respect to that count that would warrant my accepting your plea of guilty in respect thereto?

DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: This is Count One.

THE COURT: Count One.

DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: From in or about early 1987 and January 1996 in the Eastern and Southern District of New York and elsewhere, I was associated with an association in fact enterprise consisting of myself and others whose activities affected interstate commerce. During that time period I willfully and knowingly conducted and participated in the conduct of the affairs of that association in fact enterprise through a pattern of racketeering activity. I committed the following racketeering acts, among others.

Racketeering Act One: Conspiracy to murder Michael Pappadio. From in or about and between approximately 1988 and May 13, 1989, I conspired and agreed with others to murder Mike Pappadio in violation of New York Penal Law.

In furtherance of the conspiracy, I shot Michael Pappadio on or about May 13, 1989.

THE COURT: I will take them individually.

Based on the information given to me by Mr. Zappola, I find that he is acting voluntarily, he fully understands his rights and the consequences of his plea of guilty to Count One of the indictment and there is indeed a factual basis for that plea. I will, therefore, accept a plea of guilty to Count One of the indictment.

MR. LA ROSSA: Your Honor, we would like him to

```
40
    allocute to the other racketeering acts. I am afraid we have
 1
 2
    no choice, sir. There are double jeopardy factors here.
 3
    There are other jurisdictions.
 4
             THE COURT: I didn't mean to be precipitous.
    Legally, if he allocuted to one it is sufficient.
 5
 6
             MR. LA ROSSA: I think you are right but we have a
 7
    problem with it.
 8
             THE COURT: Mr. Orenstein.
 9
             MR. ORENSTEIN: Judge, he allocuted to one
10
    racketeering act.
11
             THE COURT: We need two.
12
             MR. ORENSTEIN: You need at least two to form a
13
    pattern.
14
             THE COURT: You are right. You want to allocute to
15
    all of them?
16
             MR. WATANABE:
                             Yes, Judge.
17
             MR. LA ROSSA: Afraid so, sir.
18
             Your Honor, could I read them? There is no reason
19
    why I can't.
20
             MR. ORENSTEIN: As long as he affirms the truth.
21
             MR. LA ROSSA:
                             I can.
22
             THE COURT: Listen carefully, Mr. Zappola, because I
   am going to ask you whether you understand and whether you
23
24
    agree.
25
             MR. LA ROSSA:
                             Murder of Michael Pappadio.
```

1 "On or about May 13, 1989, I knowingly, willfully and intentionally murdered and aided and abetted the murder of 2 Michael Pappadio in violation of the New York Penal Law. 3 4 Racketeering Act Number Two, conspiracy to murder 5 Julius Calder. 6 "From in or about and between approximately 1988 and June 2nd, 1989, I conspired and agreed with others to murder 7 8 Julius Calder, in violation of the New York Penal Law. 9 "In furtherance of the conspiracy I attempted to murder Julius Calder at a diner in Brooklyn in early 1989." 10 11 Racketeering Act Three: Conspiracy to Murder - The 12 New Jersey Faction: 13 "From in or about and between approximately 1989 and 14 1991, I conspired with others to murder Anthony Accetturo, 15 Sr., Anthony Accetturo, Jr., Thomas Ricciardi, Joseph LaMorte, and others whom the government has referred to collectively as 16 The New Jersey Faction, in violation of New York Penal Law. 17 18 "In furtherance of the conspiracy I traveled to Florida in 1988 and 1989 to assist in efforts to locate these 19 people." 20 21 Racketeering Act Number Four: Conspiracy to Murder 22 Peter Chiodo. 23 "From in or about and between 1990 and the spring of 1991, I conspired and agreed with others to murder Peter 24 Chiodo, in violation of New York Penal Law. 25

"In furtherance of the conspiracy, I assisted others 1 in attempting to locate Peter Chiodo for the purpose of 2 3 killing him." Racketeering Act Number Seven. We are skipping Five 4 5 and Six. 6 MR. ORENSTEIN: He is not charged with Five and Six. 7 MR. LA ROSSA: Number Seven: Conspiracy to murder 8 James Bishop. 9 "From in or about and between approximately April 1990 and May 17, 1990, I conspired and agreed with others to 10 murder James Bishop, in violation of the New York Penal Law. 11 12 "In furtherance of the conspiracy I shot James Bishop 13 on or about May 17, 1990." 14 Murder of James Bishop: "On or about May 17, 1990, I knowingly, willfully and intentionally murdered and aided and 15 abetted the murder of James Bishop, in violation of the New 16 17 York Penal Law." 18 Racketeering Act Eight: Conspiracy to murder Frank 19 Mariconda. 20 "From in or about and between approximately December '91 and February 9th, 1992, I conspired and agreed 21 with others to murder Frank Mariconda in violation of the New 22 23 York Penal Law. "In furtherance of the conspiracy I met with others 24 to plan the murder of Frank Mariconda. 25

"On or about February 9, 1992, I knowingly, willfully 1 and intentionally murdered and aided and abetted the murder of 2 Frank Mariconda, in violation of New York Penal Law." 3 4 Racketeering Act Nine - conspiracy to murder Richard 5 Taglianetti: "From in or about and between approximately 1983 and 6 July 23rd, 1992, I conspired with others to murder Richard 7 Taglianetti, in violation of the New York Penal Law. 8 9 "In furtherance of the conspiracy, I conducted surveillance in Staten Island during the spring and summer of 10 1992, for the purpose of locating and murdering Richard 11 12 Taglianetti." 13 Murder of Richard Taglianetti: "On or about July 23, 1992, I knowingly, willfully 14 and intentionally murdered and aided and abetted the murder 15 of Richard Taglianetti, in violation of the New York Penal 16 17 Law." 18 Racketeering Act Ten - Conspiracy to murder Richard 19 Guiga. 20 "From in or about and between approximately 1990 and 1993 I conspired and agreed with others to murder Richard 21 Guiga, in violation of the New York Penal Law. 22 "In furtherance of the conspiracy I conducted 23 surveillance in or about February 1992, in Manhattan, for the 24

purpose of locating and murdering Richard Guiga."

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. LaRossa.

Now, Mr. Zappola, there's an awful lot that was read by Mr. LaRossa. I want to make sure that you understand everything that was read, that these are your words, that you adopt them, that you agree with everything that was read and this does represent your confession and your admission in respect to Count One.

Is there any question about that whatsoever? DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: No.

THE COURT: Now, I will at this time specifically rule in respect to each of these pleas as we go along that there is a factual basis for the plea. As I said before, I think all you need are two racketeering acts, but for reasons that are good and sufficient reasons known to defense counsel, and perhaps to the government as well, all of those were allocuted to.

MR. LA ROSSA: So the record is perfectly clear, there is no issue about the fact that Mr. Zappola is openly affirming the violation of the law of this count. He is not agreeing, though, to all of the background of this count that has nothing to do in effect with the crime itself. His allocution is his admission of the crime.

THE COURT: I am not so sure I know exactly what that means.

MR. LA ROSSA: There are some things in there. The

1.7

45 1 background of the count refers to people --2 THE COURT: I am only talking about what he allocuted 3 to. 4 MR. LA ROSSA: That's my point. 5 THE COURT: Are you suggesting that I have heard more 6 than I need in order to accept the plea of guilty to Count 7 One? 8 MR. LA ROSSA: That wasn't in response to what you 9 This is kind of "making the record clear" that he's not said. 10 accepting all of the background information. 11 THE COURT: He's not accepting everything that's set 12 forth in the indictment? 13 MR. LA ROSSA: -- in the indictment other than his 14 allocution. MR. ORENSTEIN: Judge, we agree that the allocution 15 16 is sufficient. We, of course, stand ready to prove, if 17 necessary, everything that is in the indictment. 18 THE COURT: Based on all this information I find that the defendant is acting voluntarily, fully understands his 19 20 rights, the consequences of his plea and that there is indeed 21 a factual basis for the plea of quilty to Count One of the 22 indictment. I will therefore accept the plea of quilty to 23 that count. 24 Let's move on to Count Two.

Count Two refers to a period of time between January

1978 to the present date. It charges the defendant with 1 racketeering conspiracy and specifically that he, together 2 with others, conspired to conduct and participate, directly 3 and indirectly, in the conduct of the affairs of the 4 particular enterprise set forth in this indictment through a 5 pattern of racketeering activity by agreeing to commit and 6 7 actually committing the acts of racketeering with which each 8 such defendant is charged in Count one. 9 In terms of the conspiracy allocution, Mr. LaRossa, what do you propose? Is he able to allocute on his own or 10 11 does he need any assistance? 12 MR. LA ROSSA: Yes, your Honor. It might go 13 faster. 14 THE COURT: Why don't you do that. 15 Is it acceptable? 16 MR. ORENSTEIN: As long as whatever Mr. LaRossa states is adopted by Mr. Zappola. 17 18 THE COURT: I will ask him specifically after each of 19 those allocutions. 20 MR. LA ROSSA: Count Two. "From in or about and between the early 1990s and 21 22 January 1996, in the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, I, being employed by and associated with 23 an association in fact enterprise consisting of myself and 24 others, which enterprise engaged and the activities of which 25

affected interstate commerce, conspired and agreed to conduct and participate, both directly and indirectly, in the conduct of the affairs of that enterprise through a pattern of racketeering activity by agreeing to commit and actually committing, among others, each of the acts of racketeering to which I have previously allocuted in connection with Count One.

THE COURT: All right.

The Court is satisfied that that represents a factual basis for the plea, provided that Mr. Zappola clearly advises the Court that that does represent your allocution and that you adopt what was read by Mr. LaRossa in respect to Count Two.

Any question about that?

DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: No.

THE COURT: All right.

I will, therefore, accept the plea of guilty to Count Two and once again I find that the defendant is acting voluntarily with respect to that count, fully understands his rights and the consequences of his plea of guilty to that count, and I specifically have found that there is a factual basis for the plea.

Let's move on to Count Three.

 $$\operatorname{MR}$.$ WEINSTEIN: He is actually pleading to every count.

THE COURT: Okay. I can do it that way. What I am doing is following the format set forth in the plea agreement.

MR. ORENSTEIN: The plea agreement grouped it by the sentencing options available for each count. However, it is possible to just work through the indictment.

MR. LA ROSSA: Every count is covered, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Count Three, Conspiracy to murder Mike Pappadio refers to the dates between 1988 and May 13, 1989, and in simplified form, talks about conspiring to murder Michael Pappadio, in violation of New York Penal Law.

Mr. LaRossa.

MR. LA ROSSA: "From in or about between approximately 1988 and May 13th, 1989, in the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, and for the purpose of maintaining and increasing my position in an association in fact enterprise consisting of myself and others, which enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, I conspired and agreed with others to murder Michael Pappadio in violation of the New York Penal Law.

THE COURT: Do you adopt that? Do you agree with that, Mr. Zappola?

DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes.

THE COURT: All right.

I find specifically that the defendant is acting

voluntarily, fully understands his rights and the consequences of his plea in respect to Count Three and that there is indeed a factual basis for that plea. I will therefore accept a plea of guilty to Count Three of the indictment.

Count Four refers to the actual murder of Michael Pappadio on or about May 13, 1989. What is the allocution with respect to Count Four?

MR. LA ROSSA: On or about May 13, 1989, in the Eastern District of New York, and for the purpose of increasing my position in an association in fact enterprise consisting of myself and others, which enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, I murdered Michael Pappadio, in violation of the New York Penal Law."

THE COURT: We'll go straight through and I will make my determinations thereafter.

MR. LA ROSSA: Fine, sir.

THE COURT: Count five charges Mr. Zappola with conspiracy to murder Julius Calder.

MR. LA ROSSA: "From in or about and between approximately 1988 and June 2, 1989, in the Eastern and Souther Districts of New York and elsewhere, and for the purpose of maintaining and increasing my position in an association in fact enterprise consisting of myself and others, which enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, I conspired and agreed with others to murder Julius Calder, in

```
fact enterprise consisting of myself and others, which
  1
    enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, I conspired to
  2
    murder Anthony Accetturo, Sr., Anthony Accetturo, Jr., Thomas
 3
    Ricciardi, Joseph LaMorte and others, whom the government has
 4
    referred to collectively as the New Jersey Faction, in
 5
    violation of the New York Penal Law.
 6
 7
             THE COURT: Do you agree with that, Mr. Zappola?
 8
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes.
 9
             THE COURT: Is there any question whether that is
10
    correct? You have no question about that?
11
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA:
                                 No.
12
             THE COURT: Count Seven, conspiracy to murder Peter
13
    Chiodo.
14
             MR. LA ROSSA:
                            "From in or about and between
    approximately early 1991 and May 8, 1991, in the Eastern and
15
    Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, and for the
16
    purpose of maintaining and increasing my position in an
17
   association in fact enterprise consisting of myself and
18
   others, which enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, I
19
   conspired and agreed with others to murder Peter Chiodo, in
20
   violation of the New York Penal Law."
21
             THE COURT: Do you agree with that, Mr. Zappola?
22
23
             DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA:
```

THE COURT: I think we move forward now to

Count Twelve.

24

1 MR. LA ROSSA: Yes, we do, your Honor. 2 THE COURT: That's a conspiracy to murder Frank Mariconda. 3 4 MR. LA ROSSA: "From in or about and between approximately December 1991 and February 9, 1992, in the 5 Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, and 6 for the purpose of maintaining and increasing my position, in 7 an association in fact enterprise, consisting of myself and 8 others, which enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, I 9 conspired and agreed with others to murder Frank Mariconda, in 10 violation of the New York Penal Law." 11 THE COURT: Do you concur in that, Mr. Zappola? 12 13 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes. 14 THE COURT: Any question? Any doubts about the accuracy of what was just stated by Mr. LaRossa? 15 16 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: No. 17 THE COURT: No? 18 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: 19 THE COURT: Next Count Thirteen, the actual murder of 20 Frank Mariconda. 21 MR. LA ROSSA: "On or about February 9, 1992, in the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, and 22 for the purpose of maintaining and increasing my position, in 23 an association in fact enterprise, consisting of myself and 24 others, which enterprise engaged in racketeering activities, I 25

murdered and aided and abetted the murder of Frank Mariconda, 1 in violation of the New York Penal Law. THE COURT: Mr. Zappola, once again, do you agree 3 with that? Do you have any question about the accuracy of 4 5 what was just stated by Mr. LaRossa? 6 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: No. 7 THE COURT: You agree with, you have no problems 8 with? 9 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes. 10 THE COURT: You adopt it as your words? 11 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Count Fourteen, conspiracy to murder Richard Taglianetti. 13 14 MR. LA ROSSA: "From in or about and between approximately 1983 and July 23, 1992, in the Eastern and 15 Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, and for the 16 17 purpose of maintaining and increasing my position in an association in fact enterprise, consisting of myself and 18 19 others, which enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, I conspired and agreed with others to murder Richard 20 Taglianetti, in violation of the New York Penal Law. 21 THE COURT: Once again, Mr. Zappola, do you have any 22 23 question about the accuracy of what was just stated by 24 Mr. LaRossa?

DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: No.

I murdered Taglianetti.

1 THE COURT: You agree with what was said? 2 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Right. 3 THE COURT: All right. Let's deal with Count Fifteen next, which is the 4 actual murder of Taglianetti. 5 MR. LA ROSSA: On or about July 23, 1992, in the 6 Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, and 7 for the purpose of maintaining and increasing my position in 8 an association in fact enterprise consisting of myself and 9 others, which enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, I 10 11 murdered and aided and abetted the murder of Richard Taglianetti, in violation of the New York Penal Law. 12 13 Is that correct, Mr. Zappola? THE COURT: 14 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: I did it. Yes. 15 THE COURT: Count Sixteen, conspiracy to murder 16 Richard Guiga. 17 MR. LA ROSSA: "From in or about and between approximately 1990 and 1993, in the Eastern and Southern 18 Districts of New York and elsewhere, and for the purpose of 19 maintaining and increasing my position in an association in 20 fact enterprise consisting of myself and others, which 21 enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, I conspired and 22 agreed with others to murder Richard Guiga, in violation of 23

THE COURT: Is that true?

the New York Penal Law."

24

1 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes. 2 THE COURT: All right. 3 We move now to Count Nineteen, accessory after the fact, referring to the dates between May 30, 1990 and January 4 5 19th, 1993. 6 Mr. LaRossa. 7 MR. LA ROSSA: "From in or about and between approximately May 30, 1990 and January 19, 1993, in the 8 Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, I 9 knowingly and intentionally received, relieved, comforted and 10 assisted Anthony Casso in order to hinder and prevent his 11 apprehension, trial and punishment, knowing that Anthony Casso 12 had committed various offenses against the United States, 13 14 including, but not limited to, conspiracy to commit murder, attempted murder and murder, all in aid of racketeering, in 15 16 violation of 18, U.S.C., Section 1959. THE COURT: Once again, Mr. Zappola, I know this may 17 be sounding monotonous, but I am going to make sure that what 18 19 Mr. LaRossa is reading is understood by you. Does that represent your words and do you agree with 20 everything he says and do you adopt that with respect to that 21 22 count, as well as the others? 23 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes, I do. 24 THE COURT: All right.

At this time, I think we are up to Count Twenty.

MR. LA ROSSA: "From in or about May 30, 1990, and January 19, 1939, in the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, I knowingly and intentionally harbored and concealed Anthony Casso, for whose arrest a warrant had been issued by the federal government, in order to prevent his discovery and arrest, after I had notice and knowledge of the fact that such a warrant had been issued for his apprehension."

THE COURT: Once again, Mr. Zappola, do you concur with what was stated by Mr. LaRossa, do you adopt those as your own words?

DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Count Twenty-one, the last count before we get to the information.

MR. LA ROSSA: "From in or about and between 1978 and January 1996, in the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, I conspired and agreed with others to defraud the United States by impeding, impairing, obstructing and defeating the lawful functions of the Treasury Department the ascertainment, computation and collection of income taxes due and owing for myself and others.

"In furtherance of the conspiracy, I filed a false and misleading federal income tax return on or about July 25th, 1990, for the year 1989.

THE COURT: For the sake of having a brief pause, let

me rule that in respect to each of these counts in the indictment to which the defendant has pled guilty -- and I take it you also adopt what Mr. LaRossa has just stated in respect to Count Twenty-one, Mr. Zappola, as well?

> DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: With respect to each of these that I have not attended to before, which would be Counts Four, Five, Six, Seven, Twelve, Thirteen, Fourteen, Fifteen, Sixteen, Nineteen, Twenty, Twenty-one, I find that the defendant is acting voluntarily with respect to each of these, fully understands his rights and consequences of his plea of guilty to each of those counts in the indictment, and that there is indeed a factual basis for the plea of guilty to each of those counts. I, therefore accept the pleas of guilty to those counts, and at this time we will move to the counts set forth in the information.

With respect to that, Count One charges the defendant with the murder of Anthony DiLapi on or about February 4, 1990.

Mr. LaRossa.

MR. LA ROSSA: "On or about February 4, 1990, in the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York, the Central District of California and elsewhere, and for the purpose of maintaining and increasing my position in an association in fact enterprise consisting of myself and others, which

58 enterprise was engaged in racketeering activity, I knowingly, willfully, deliberately and with premeditation and with malice aforethought murdered and aided and abetted the murder of Anthony DiLapi in violation of Section 187 (a) and other related sections of the California Penal Code and the New York Penal Law. THE COURT: Mr. Zappola, relief is in sight but I ask you once again, just as important now as the first time I asked you these questions: Do you agree with everything that Mr. LaRossa just stated? Do you adopt that as the truth? Does this represent your testimony in respect to, so to speak, your allocution and that you adopt this as your words? DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes. THE COURT: All right. Count Two, murder of Victor Filocomo. MR. LA ROSSA: No. THE COURT: Strike that. Let's move on to count --MR. WEINSTEIN: I think you are looking at the information for Mr. Conte. Count One is the same in both informations. THE COURT: Count Two, murder of John "Otto" Heidel, on or about October 13, 1987. MR. LA ROSSA: "On or about October 13, 1987, in the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, and

for the purpose of maintaining and increasing my position in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

an association in fact enterprise, consisting of myself and 1 others, which enterprise was engaged in racketeering activity, 2 I murdered and aided and abetted the murder of John "Otto" 3 Heidel, in violation of the New York Penal Law. 4 5 THE COURT: Do you agree and do you adopt that as your statement, Mr. Zappola? 6 7 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes, I do. 8 THE COURT: Count Three, conspiracy to murder Robert Scarpaci in or about the early 1908s. 9 10 "In or about approximately the early MR. LA ROSSA: 11 1980s, in the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, and for the purpose of maintaining and increasing 12 my position in an association in fact enterprise consisting of 13 14 myself and others, which enterprise was engaged in racketeering activity, I conspired and agreed with others to 15 murder Robert Scarpaci, in violation of the New York Penal 16 17 Law." 18 THE COURT: Do you agree that this is correctly 19 stated, Mr. Zappola? 20 DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes. 21 Count Four, conspiracy to murder Burt THE COURT: Kaplan in or about 1993. 22 23 MR. LA ROSSA: "In or about approximately 1993, in the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, 24

and for the purpose of maintaining and increasing my position

```
in an association in fact enterprise consisting of myself and
 others, which enterprise was engaged in racketeering activity,
 I conspired and agreed with others to murder Burt Kaplan, in
 violation of the New York Penal Law."
          THE COURT: Mr. Zappola, do you agree with that?
         MR. ZAPPOLA: Yes, I do.
         THE COURT: Do you adopt that as your statement?
         DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes, I do.
         THE COURT: Count Five, conspiracy to murder Peter
Chiodo's relatives in or about and between July 1, 1991, and
March 1992.
         MR. LA ROSSA:
                        "From in or about and between
approximately July 1991 and March 1992, in the Eastern and
Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, and for the
purpose of maintaining and increasing my position in an
association in fact enterprise consisting of myself and
others, which enterprise was engaged in racketeering activity,
I conspired and agreed with others to murder relatives of
Peter Chiodo, specifically Thomas Signorino and Patricia
```

Cappazola, in violation of the New York Penal Law."

THE COURT: Mr. Zappola, do you agree with that?

MR. ZAPPOLA: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: All right.

Last, Count Six, conspiracy to murder Nicholas Guido and Bob Bering in or about and between October 1986 and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 January 1993.

MR. LA ROSSA: From in or about and between approximately October '86 and January '93, in the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, and for the purpose of maintaining and increasing my position in an association in fact enterprise consisting of myself and others, which enterprise was engaged in racketeering activity, I conspired and agreed with others to murder Nicholas Guido and Bob Bering, in violation of the New York Penal Law."

THE COURT: Do you agree that that is an accurate reading and that those represent your involvement in those matters, Mr. Zappola?

DEFENDANT ZAPPOLA: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: All right.

Based upon all this information given to me, I find in respect to the six counts in the information that the defendant is acting voluntarily with respect to each; that he fully understands his rights, the consequences of his pleas of guilty, and that there are indeed factual bases for the pleas of guilty with respect to Counts One through Six of the information. I will therefore accept the pleas of guilty to Count One, Two, Three, Four, Five and Six of the information.

MR. LA ROSSA: Not to be redundant. Mr. Zappola again reiterates that is his allocution and the admission of guilt, and he does not agree with all other statements in both

```
the information that was filed and the indictment.
  1
  2
              THE COURT: You made your record in that respect.
  3
              MR. LA ROSSA:
                              Thank you.
                          Is there anything the Court may have
  4
              THE COURT:
     inadvertently omitted in the course of these rather elaborate
  5
    proceedings that the government feels obliged to call to my
  6
  7
    attention?
              MR. ORENSTEIN: Judge, after consultation with
 8
    counsel, I believe it is our impression that your Honor
 9
    covered the waiver of indictment at the very beginning of
10
11
    these proceedings.
12
             THE COURT:
                          I did.
13
             MR. ORENSTEIN: Other than that, I believe the
    allocution by Mr. Zappola has been sufficient to all of the
14
    counts to which he has pleaded guilty.
15
             THE COURT: Anything further from your quarters,
16
17
    Mr. LaRossa?
18
             MR. LA ROSSA:
                             No, sir.
             THE COURT: Thank you, gentlemen.
19
20
             That takes care of the allocutions and the pleas in
    respect to the Defendant Zappola.
21
22
             We shall set a date for sentencing. What is your
   preference in respect to that?
23
             I've got to get a presentence report.
24
25
             MR. ORENSTEIN:
                             May we suggest we set a date.
```

proves inconvenient to the parties or the Court, we can confer 1 2 further. 3 If we're going to do it in September, MR. LA ROSSA: I am going to be out of the country until the --4 5 First week in October, October 4th. THE CLERK: 6 THE COURT: I may not be here then. 7 MR. LA ROSSA: Everybody is in custody. 8 THE COURT: Put October 4, 10:00 a.m. 9 Mr. LaRossa, you are free to leave. 10 MR. LA ROSSA: Thank you. THE COURT: Thank you for your cooperation. 11 going to take a five-minute break for obvious reasons, and 12 we'll then address Mr. Watanabe's client. 13 14 (Recess). 15 THE COURT: Mr. Watanabe, are you ready to proceed? 16 MR. WATANABE: Yes, Judge. 17 THE COURT: Are you also prepared to use the same 18 format that Mr. LaRossa did? 1.9 MR. WATANABE: Yes, Judge, more or less. Does Your Honor mind if I do it from the table? 20 21 THE COURT: No. 22 We are up to the allocutions. 23 All right. Now, at this time, let's use the same format in going 24 through the indictment in respect to Mr. Conte. 25

Let me once again first address Count One, the racketeering count, and of course the various racketeering acts set forth therein that pertain to Mr. Conte.

At this time, Mr. Watanabe, are you prepared to put forth an allocution for your client's consideration and adoption?

MR. WATANABE: I am, your Honor. However, before I begin, I would like to reiterate Mr. LaRossa's remarks, that the allocution that is about to occur constitutes Mr. Conte's admissions to the crimes to which he would be pleading, and that with respect to other allegations that may be contained within the indictment, they are disagreed with and not adopted in any way, fashion or form.

THE COURT: Spoken like an auspicious lawyer but, obviously, you are talking about what's going to be allocuted to and whether that satisfies the requisite elements for each of these counts.

With that understanding, you may proceed.

MR. WATANABE: With respect to Count One, the RICO count, "From in or about and between 1987 and in the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, I was associated with an association in fact enterprise consisting of myself and others whose activities affected interstate commerce. During that time I willfully conducted and participated in the conduct of the affairs of that association

65 in fact enterprise through a pattern of racketeering activity. As part of the pattern of racketeering activity, I committed the following racketeering acts, among others: Racketeering Act One, Conspiracy to Murder and the Murder of Julius Calder. MR. ORENSTEIN: If I can interrupt, that's Racketeering Act Two. MR. WATANABE: Act Two. "From in or about and between 1988 and June 2, 1989, I conspired with persons known and unknown to murder and did in fact murder Julius Calder in violation of New York Penal Law, Sections 125.5 and 20." With respect to Racketeering Act Three, conspiracy to murder the New Jersey Faction: "From in or about and between 1989 and 1991, I conspired with others to murder Anthony Accetturo, Sr., Anthony Accetturo, Jr., Thomas Ricciardi, Joseph LaMorte and others, whom the government has referred to collectively as the New Jersey Faction, in violation of New York Penal Law. THE COURT: Can I just go back. It is getting late Racketeering Act One in the indictment refers to in the day. the conspiracy to murder and the murder of Michael Pappadio. MR. WATANABE: That's correct. I was corrected.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The murder of Julius Calder is actually racketeering Act Two. I clarified myself.

```
1
              THE COURT:
                          So --
  2
              MR. WATANABE:
                              I misspoke.
              THE COURT: Michael Pappadio. I am just trying to
 3
    find where Mr. Conte's name is set forth in Racketeering Act
 4
 5
    One.
 6
             MR. ORENSTEIN:
                             Judge, Mr. Conte is not charged in
 7
    Racketeering Act One.
 8
             THE COURT: That's what I am concerned about.
 9
             MR. WATANABE:
                              I misspoke when I said it was
10
    Racketeering Act One.
             THE COURT: The first one you are talking to is
11
12
    Racketeering Act Two.
13
             MR. WATANABE:
                             Act Two.
14
             Yes, sir.
15
             MR. ORENSTEIN: Judge, before we move on, past the
    Calder murder, I think what's been said so far goes a long way
16
    towards satisfying the elements. It doesn't quite get there.
17
18
             The concern I have is, when Mr. Zappola allocuted,
    for instance, to the Pappadio murder, part of his allocution
19
    included a specific act such as shooting or conducting a
20
21
                   I think that without some such act being
    surveillance.
   admitted to by the defendant, which has not yet been heard
22
   with respect to the Calder murder, it is not a sufficient plea
23
24
   under Rule 11.
            THE COURT: You know, in terms of the allocution in
25
```

```
respect to the enterprise and his association with the enterprise, pattern of racketeering, they are somewhat general, but I think they suffice. When it comes to the requisite minimum two acts, I think they have to be specifically set forth.

Mr. Watanabe, why don't you consider that and reflect upon that.

MR. WATANABE: Yes, sir.

With respect to Racketeering Act Two, the conspiracy to murder and the murder of Julius Calder, in addition to what I have stated before on the record, in furtherance of the conspiracy, Mr. Conte murdered Mr. Calder, shot Julius Calder to death.
```

Does that suffice for the government?

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$ ORENSTEIN: It does. Thank you. As long as $\operatorname{Mr}.$ Conte adopts that statement.

THE COURT: Was that act related to the affairs of the enterprise or did the defendant commit these acts by virtue of his position or involvement in the affairs of the enterprise? I want to determine that as well.

MR. WATANABE: And that the death of Mr. Calder was in actual furtherance of that association of that enterprise.

THE COURT: Mr. Conte, do you hear all of this? Do you have any question as to the accuracy of what was just stated by your counsel on the record?

```
Do you agree that that accurately does represent what
your involvement was in respect to Count One and,
specifically, in respect to the first act of racketeering?
         DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes.
         THE COURT: Which is really the second one that's set
forth in the indictment?
         DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, Judge.
         THE COURT: All right.
         Go ahead.
         MR. WATANABE: Where would the Court like me to
begin?
         THE COURT: You are going to continue with additional
acts of racketeering here.
         MR. WATANABE: I will address Racketeering Act
Three.
         I will again reiterate for the record that from in or
about approximately 1988 and 1991, Mr. Conte conspired with
others to murder Anthony Accetturo, Sr., Anthony Accetturo,
Jr., Thomas Ricciardi, Joseph LaMorte and others -- and the
government has referred to them collectively as the New Jersey
Faction -- in violation of the New York Penal Law.
         "And in furtherance of that conspiracy I met with
others to discuss the murder of those persons referenced as
the New Jersey Faction."
         THE COURT: And were these acts related to the
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
69
 1
    affairs of the enterprise?
 2
              MR. WATANABE:
                             They were, your Honor.
 3
             THE COURT: Do you agree, Mr. Conte, to everything
    that was just set forth by your attorney?
 4
 5
             DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, your Honor.
 6
             THE COURT:
                         Do you adopt that as if you were speaking
 7
    the words yourself?
 8
             DEFENDANT CONTE:
                               Yes, sir.
 9
             THE COURT: No question about that, is there?
10
             DEFENDANT CONTE:
                               No question.
11
             THE COURT: Continue.
12
             MR. WATANABE:
                             Racketeering Act Four.
13
             "From in or about and between 1990 and in the spring
    of 1991, I conspired with and agreed with other persons to
14
    murder Peter Chiodo, in violation of New York Penal Law.
15
16
             "In furtherance of the conspiracy, I assisted others
    in attempting to locate Peter Chiodo for the purpose of
17
18
    killing him."
19
             THE COURT: Once again, I want you to tell me whether
    all of this was related to the affairs of the enterprise.
20
21
             MR. WATANABE:
                             It was, Judge.
22
             THE COURT: Go through the rest, and then I will ask
    whether he adopts all of this.
23
24
             MR. WATANABE:
                            Okay.
25
            Racketeering Act Seven, Conspiracy to Murder James
```

1 Bishop. 2 "From in or about and between approximately April 1990 and May 17, 1990, I conspired and agreed with others to 3 murder James Bishop, in violation of New York Penal Law. 4 5 "In furtherance of the conspiracy I shot" -- Mr. 6 Conte shot Mr. James Bishop on or about May 17, 1990, and that such crime was committed in violation of New York Penal Law 7 and in fact that was done in furtherance of the association in fact enterprise. 9 10 THE COURT: Do you agree with that and do you agree 11 with the prior statements in respect to the racketeering acts that your counsel has set forth? 12 13 DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Do you have any question at all that you want to speak to your attorney about in respect to that? 15 16 DEFENDANT CONTE: No, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Do you have any more, Mr. Watanabe? 18 MR. WATANABE: Yes, I do, Judge. 19 Racketeering Act Nine, conspiracy to murder and the 20 murder of Richard Taglianetti. 21 "From in or about 1983 and July 23, 1992, Mr. Conte

D.Pereira, OCR

22

conspired with oth pË

```
murder."
1
 2
             THE COURT:
                         Once again --
             MR. WATANABE: And that in or about July 1992,
3
4
   Mr. Taglianetti was in fact murdered by being shot to death by
5
   George Conte and this was all in furtherance of the
   association in fact enterprise.
6
7
             MR. ORENSTEIN: Judge, may I have a moment to confer
8
   with counsel?
 9
             MR. WATANABE:
                             Go ahead.
10
             (Pause.)
                             Judge, I misspoke.
11
             MR. WATANABE:
12
             I would withdraw that portion that stated that Mr.
   Conte shot and killed Mr. Taglianetti. But for the purposes
13
    of this allocution, with respect to the specific racketeering
14
15
   act, he did in fact conspire with other persons by conducting
16
   surveillance of Mr. Taglianetti and that on a subsequent date
17
   in 1992, Mr. Taglianetti was in fact shot and killed.
18
             THE COURT: What other racketeering acts does he wish
   to acknowledge and own up and confess to?
19
20
             MR. WATANABE:
                             Racketeering Act Ten, conspiracy to
   murder Richard Guiga. That from in or about and between
21
22
    approximately 1990 and 1993, Mr. Conte conspired and agreed
23
    with others to murder Richard Guiga, in violation of New York
   Penal Law.
24
             And that in furtherance of the conspiracy, he met and
25
```

```
discussed with others the murder of Mr. Guiga, and again, this
 1
    act was done in furtherance of the association in fact
 2
 3
    enterprise.
 4
             THE COURT:
                         Anything else?
 5
             MR. ORENSTEIN: Your Honor, those are all the
    racketeering acts with which Mr. Conte is charged.
 6
 7
             THE COURT:
                        Mr. Conte, having heard your lawyer set
 8
    forth all of these acts and everything else that you said in
 9
    respect to Count One, do you agree with everything that he
    said? Do you adopt what he said as your words?
10
11
             DEFENDANT CONTE:
                               Yes, your Honor.
12
             THE COURT:
                         Is there anything at all that he said
13
    that you are in disagreement about whatsoever?
14
             DEFENDANT CONTE:
                               No, your Honor.
15
             THE COURT: Let's move on to Count Two of the
    indictment, racketeering conspiracy.
16
17
             Mr. Watanabe, what does your client say in respect to
18
    that?
19
             MR. WATANABE:
                             From in or about and between the
   early 1970s and the date of the superseding indictment in the
20
   Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, Mr.
21
    Conte, being employed by and associated with an association in
22
23
    fact enterprise consisting of himself and others, which
    enterprise engaged in the activities of which affected
24
25
   interstate commerce, did conspire and agree to conduct and
```

73 participate, both directly and indirectly, in the conduct of the affairs of that association in fact enterprise through a pattern of racketeering activity by agreeing to permit and actually committing, among other things, each of the racketeering acts to which he had previously allocuted in Count One. THE COURT: Mr. Conte, do you agree with the statements made by your attorney in your behalf in respect to Count Two? Do you adopt them as your words? Do you have any question whatsoever about the accuracy of what was just said? Do you adopt those as your own words? DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, I do. THE COURT: You have no question about the accuracy of what is said? DEFENDANT CONTE: No question. THE COURT: Let's move on to Count Number Six, conspiracy to murder the New Jersey Faction. What does the defendant have to say in respect to that count? MR. WATANABE: With regard to Count Six, from in or about and between approximately 1988 and 1991, in the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, and for the

purpose of maintaining and increasing Mr. Conte's position in

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

an association in fact enterprise consisting of himself and 1. others, which enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, he 2 conspired to murder Anthony Accetturo, Anthony Accetturo, Jr., 3 Thomas Ricciardi, Joseph LaMorte and others, whom the 4 government has collectively referred to as the New Jersey 5 Faction, in violation of New York Penal Law, and in 6 furtherance of such a conspiracy, did in fact meet and discuss 7 the murder of the above-referenced individuals. 8 THE COURT: Do you agree with all of that, Mr. 9 Conte? 10 Do you adopt those words as your words? 11 DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, I do, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: You do. 13 Count Seven, conspiracy to murder Peter Chiodo. 14 MR. WATANABE: Count Seven, conspiracy to murder 15 Peter Chiodo. 16 From in or about or about and between early 1991 and 17 May 8, 1991, in the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York 18 and elsewhere, for the purpose of maintaining and increasing 19 Mr. Conte's position in an association in fact enterprise 20 consisting of himself and others, which enterprise engaged in 21 racketeering activity, he conspired and agreed with others to 22 murder Peter Chiodo, in violation of New York Penal Law. 23 THE COURT: Do you agree with all of that, Mr. 24 25 Conte?

```
1
             DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, I do.
 2
             THE COURT: Count Eight, attempted murder of Peter
   Chiodo.
3
                            On or about May 8, 1991, in the
4
             MR. WATANABE:
5
   Eastern District of New York and Southern District of New York
   and elsewhere, the defendant, Mr. Conte, attempted to murder
7
   Peter Chiodo, in violation of New York Penal Law, by shooting
   Peter Chiodo --
9
             THE COURT: That's a pretty good attempt.
10
             MR. WATANABE: -- for the purpose of maintaining and
11
   increasing his position with the association in fact
12
   enterprise.
13
             THE COURT: All right.
14
             Do you agree, Mr. Conte, that you did shoot
   Mr. Chiodo?
15
16
             DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, I do.
             THE COURT: And everything else that was just stated
17
18
   by your attorney, Mr. Watanabe?
19
             DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, your Honor.
20
             THE COURT: Count Fourteen, Conspiracy to Murder of
   Richard Taglianetti.
21
22
             MR. WATANABE: From in or about July 23, 1992 in the
23
   Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, and
24
   for the purpose of maintaining and increasing his position
25
   with an association in fact enterprise consisting of myself
```

and others, which enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, 1 Mr. Conte murdered and aided and abetted the murder of Richard 2 Taglianetti, in violation of New York Penal Law. 3 This was, once again, done for the THE COURT: 4 purposes of maintaining and increasing his position in the 5 Luchese Crime Family, or the enterprise that you had 6 identified? 7 Your Honor, it is with respect to the MR. WATANABE: 8 furtherance of the enterprise with respect to the association 9 in fact enterprise. 10 THE COURT: Okay. Do you agree with all of that, Mr. 11 Conte? 12 DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, I do, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Count Fifteen. 14 Sixteen. MR. WATANABE: 15 THE COURT: I'm sorry, we are up to Fifteen. 16 We're up to Fifteen, excuse me. MR. WATANABE: 17 THE COURT: Now we're talking about the murder 18 19 Richard Taglianetti. On or about July 23, 1992, in the MR. WATANABE: 20 Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, and 21 for the purpose of maintaining and increasing Mr. Conte's 22 position in an association in fact enterprise consisting of 23 himself and others, which enterprise engaged in racketeering 24 activity, Mr. Conte murdered and aided and abetted in the 25

1 murder of Richard Taglianetti in violation of New York Penal 2 Law.

THE COURT: Do you agree with all of that, Mr. Conte? Did you indeed do that?

DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, I did.

THE COURT: Count Sixteen, Conspiracy to Murder Richard Guiga.

MR. WATANABE: From in or about approximately 1990 and 1993, in the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, and for the purpose of maintaining and increasing his position in an association in fact enterprise consisting of himself and others, which enterprise engaged in racketeering activity, he conspired and agreed with others to murder Richard Guiga, in violation of New York Penal Law.

THE COURT: Did you indeed do that, and do you agree with everything that your attorney just stated?

DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Now, Nineteen, Accessory After the Fact.

MR. WATANABE: From in or about and approximately May 30, 1990, and January 19, 1993, in the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, Mr. Conte knowingly and intentionally received, relieved, comforted and assisted Anthony Casso in order to hinder and prevent his apprehension, trial and punishment, knowing that Anthony Casso had committed various offenses against the United States, including, but not

```
limited to, conspiracy to commit murder, attempted murder, and
1
   murder, all in aid of racketeering, in violation of 18,
   U.S.C., 1959.
3
            THE COURT: Do you adopt and do you agree with
4
   everything that was just spoken by your attorney, Mr. Conte?
5
            DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, I do.
6
7
            THE COURT: Count Twenty, Harboring.
                             From in or about May 30, 1990 and
8
            MR. WATANABE:
9
   January 19, 1993, in the Eastern and Southern Districts of New
   York and elsewhere, Mr. Conte knowingly and intentionally
10
   harbored and concealed Anthony Casso, for whose arrest a
11
12
   warrant had been issued by the federal government, in order to
   prevent his discovery and arrest, after he had notice and
13
   knowledge of the fact that such a warrant had been issued for
14
   his apprehension.
15
             THE COURT: Do you have any question in your mind
16
   that that is an accurate statement of the aspects of Count
17
   Twenty as your attorney has just set them forth, Mr. Conte?
18
19
            DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, your Honor.
             THE COURT: Do you adopt that as your statement?
20
             DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, I do.
21
             THE COURT: Last part of the indictment, Count
22
23
    Twenty-one, Conspiracy to Defraud the United States.
             MR. WATANABE: From in or about and between 1978 and
24
   the date of this superseding indictment, in the Eastern and
25
```

1 Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, Mr. Conte 2 conspired and agreed with others to defraud the United States by impeding, impairing, obstructing and defeating the lawful 3 4 functions of the Treasury Department in the ascertainment, 5 computation, and collection of income taxes due and owing from 6 himself and others, and in furtherance of that conspiracy, Mr. 7 Conte failed to file tax returns in the years 1989, 1990, and 1991. 8 9 THE COURT: Do you agree that that actually did 10 happen? Do you agree with everything that was just spread on 11 the record by your attorney? 12 DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, I understand. THE COURT: And you adopt that as your acts? 13 14 DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Let's move to the information. 15 16 Count One, murder of Anthony DiLapi on or about 17 February 4, 1990. MR. WATANABE: Count One of the information, Murder 18 19 of Anthony DiLapi. 20 On or about February 4, 1990, in the Eastern District of New York and elsewhere, including the Central District of 21 22 California and elsewhere, and for the purpose of maintaining 23 and increasing his position in an association in fact 24 enterprise consisting of himself and others, which enterprise 25 was engaged in racketeering activity, Mr. Conte did knowingly,

```
willfully, deliberately and with premeditation and malice
1
   aforethought murdered and aided and abetted the murder of
2
   Anthony DiLapi, in violation of Section 187 and other related
3
   sections of the California Penal Code and New York Penal Law.
4
             THE COURT: Do you agree that you did that, Mr.
5
   Conte?
6
                               Yes, I do, your Honor.
             DEFENDANT CONTE:
7
             THE COURT: Count Two, murder of Victor Filocomo on
8
   or about October 18, 1988.
9
             MR. WATANABE: On or about October 18, 1988, in the
10
   Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, and
11
   for the purpose of maintaining and increasing his position in
12
   an association in fact enterprise consisting of himself and
13
   others, which enterprise was engaged in racketeering activity,
14
   Mr. Conte murdered and aided and abetted the murder of Victor
15
    Filocomo, in violation of New York Penal Law.
16
             THE COURT: Do you agree that you did that, Mr.
17
    Conte?
18
             DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, I do, your Honor.
19
             THE COURT: Count Three, murder of Nicholas Izzo on
20
    or about October 27th, 1983.
21
             MR. WATANABE: Count three, murder of Nicholas Izzo.
22
             On or about October 27, 1983, in the Eastern and
23
    Southern District of New York and elsewhere, and for the
24
    purpose of maintaining and increasing his position in an
25
```

81 association in fact enterprise, consisting of himself and others, which enterprise was engaged in racketeering activity, Mr. Conte did murder and aided and abetted the murder of Nicholas Izzo, in violation of New York Penal Law. THE COURT: Do you agree that you did that? DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, I did, your Honor. THE COURT: Count Four, Conspiracy to Murder Burt Kaplan in or about 1993. MR. WATANABE: In or about and approximately 1993, in the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, and for the purpose of maintaining and increasing his position in an association in fact enterprise consisting of himself and others, which enterprise was engaged in racketeering activity, Mr. Conte conspired and agreed with others to murder Burt Kaplan, in violation of the New York Penal Law. THE COURT: Do you adopt those words as your words? Do you agree that that is correct? DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, I do. THE COURT: Count Five, Conspiracy to Murder Joseph Marra in or about 1993. In or about 1993, in the Eastern and MR. WATANABE: Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere, and for the purpose of maintaining and increasing his position in an

association in fact enterprise consisting of himself and

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
others, which enterprise was engaged in racketeering activity,
   Mr. Conte conspired and agreed with others to murder Joseph
   Marra, in violation of New York Penal Law.
3
             THE COURT: Do you agree that you did that? Do you
4
   adopt that as your words?
5
                               Yes, I did.
             DEFENDANT CONTE:
6
             THE COURT: Count Six, Conspiracy to Murder John Dunn
7
8
    in or about the summer of 1988.
                             In or about the summer of 1988, in
             MR. WATANABE:
9
    the Eastern and Southern Districts of New York and elsewhere,
10
    and for the purpose of maintaining and increasing his position
11
    in an association in fact enterprise consisting of himself and
12
    others, which enterprise was engaged in racketeering activity,
13
    Mr. Conte conspired and agreed with others to murder John
14
    Dunn, in violation of New York Penal Law.
15
             THE COURT: All right.
16
             Do you adopt that as your words?
17
             DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, I do.
18
             THE COURT: Do you agree with everything that was
19
    just said?
20
             DEFENDANT CONTE: Yes, I do.
21
             THE COURT: No question about that?
22
23
             DEFENDANT CONTE: No question.
             THE COURT: Based on the information given to me, I
24
    find the defendant is acting voluntarily in respect to each of
25
```

```
these pleas, fully understands his rights and the consequences
   of each of these pleas of guilty, and that there is indeed a
   factual basis for each of these pleas. I therefore accept the
3
   pleas of guilty to Counts One and Two of the indictment, to
   Counts Fifteen of the indictment, and each of Counts One
5
   through Three of the information, also as to Count Six, Seven,
6
   Eight, Fourteen and Sixteen of the indictment and Counts Four
7
   through Six of the information. Further, in respect to Counts
8
   Nineteen and Twenty and Twenty-one of the indictment as well.
9
             I will also set sentence date for October 4th, if
1.0
   memory serves me correctly, at 10:00 a.m., in respect to Mr.
11
    Conte as I have done so with respect to Mr. Zappola.
12
             At this time, is there any other information or
13
    matters that the government is concerned about that the Court
14
    should be made aware before I conclude these proceedings?
15
             Mr. Orenstein, anything further?
16
             MR. ORENSTEIN:
                             No.
17
             Thank you, your Honor.
18
             THE COURT: Mr. Watanabe, anything further in respect
19
    to your client that you wish to put on the record or bring to
20
    my attention at this time?
21
                              No, Judge.
              MR. WATANABE:
 22
                          All right.
              THE COURT:
 23
                                                 Thank you very
                              Thank you, Judge.
              MR. ORENSTEIN:
 24
     much for staying late and your cooperating personnel.
 25
```